DATING SECOND ZECHARIAH: A LINGUISTIC REEXAMINATION

by

ANDREW E. HILL

Huntington College, Indiana

ABSTRACT: The chronological relationship of Deutero-Zechariah to the other post-Exilic prophetic literature has long been the subject of much discussion among biblical scholars. Zechariah 9–14 has been dated anywhere from the 7th to the 2nd century b.c.

This study of Zechariah 10–14 features a purely linguistic analysis of the text, and consists of a systematic application of nineteen grammatical and syntactic categories developed by R. Polzin (*Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, 1976) for the purpose of distinguishing the relative chronological relationships of early and late biblical Hebrew prose. Rather than relating Zechariah 10–14 to post-Exilic social conditions and historical events which presuppose an absolute chronology, this analysis relates Zechariah 10–14 (and Malachi) to post-Exilic literature, and therefore to a literary and a relative chronological scale.

As a result, it is clear that Zechariah 10–14 (and Malachi) are linguistically similar to Haggai, Zechariah 1–8 and Polzin's P^g corpus, in contrast to Polzin's P^s, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah[2] corpora; and therefore must be dated between ca. 515 and 450 b.c., a date of ca. 515–475 b.c. being preferred.

I

The date of Zechariah 9–14 and its relation to the other biblical writings, especially the other post-Exilic prophetic books, has long been the

*This article represents the expansion and refinement of portions of the writer's University of Michigan doctoral dissertation, *The Book of Malachi: Its Place in Post-Exilic Chronology Linguistically Reconsidered* (Hill, 1981).

subject of research and debate in the field of biblical scholarship. The range of chronological possibilities for these oracles includes a *terminus a quo* of the 7th or even 8th century b.c., the date suggested for Zechariah 9–14, or parts of it, by early biblical scholars like B. G. Flugge (1784), Archbishop Newcome (1809), and L. Berthold (1814); and a *terminus ad quem* of approximately 150 or 140 b.c. assigned to so-called Deutero-Zechariah by E. Sellin (1930), among others.[1] All subsequent studies on the date of the chapters under investigation may be placed on a timeline bounded by this 8th century b.c. date on the one extreme and the 2nd century b.c. date on the other. The present article complements research on Zechariah 9–14 and its chronological relationship to the other post-Exilic prophetic books, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, and Malachi, by presenting a purely linguistic analysis of the text. This approach contrasts sharply with previous investigations of Zechariah 9–14, which have relied largely on thematic studies, ritual practices, and lexical parallels, as well as on descriptions of the religious, social, and political conditions within the post-Exilic Jewish community recorded in the post-Exilic prophets and Ezra and Nehemiah, in order to date the oracles in Zechariah 9–14.[2] The linguistic analysis characteristic of this study is based upon the *typological* approach of R. Polzin (1976), and involves systematic application of nineteen grammatical and syntactic categories developed by Polzin for the express purpose of distinguishing the relative chronological relation of early and late biblical Hebrew prose. Polzin's target corpus was the so-called P strand of biblical Hebrew. My study applies Polzin's methodology to Zechariah 9–14, working with Polzin's already established corpora, as well as with the dated texts of Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 as control corpora (since the validity of the 520 b.c. date in the superscriptions to the two books is now almost universally acknowledged by biblical scholars). Through the application of these nineteen categories, Polzin produces a typological continuum of biblical Hebrew narrative prose, demonstrating the relative chronological relationships of the corpora selected for analysis. My typological examination of the post-Exilic prophets endeavors to place Zechariah 9–14 onto this continuum, and extends the field of study to include prophetic or oracular prose.

The methodology of this linquistic analysis has a direct bearing on the notion of chronology used in this study. Previous research on Zechariah 9–14, utilizing such criteria as thematic similarities and lexical parallels,

1. For a more detailed survey of the literature regarding the dating of Zechariah 9–14 see Hill, 1981, pp. 11–13. The most recent and complete bibliography on the book of Zechariah is that of Childs, 1979, pp. 472–74, 487.

2. A notable exception is the work of Radday and Wickmann (1975), who, based upon a statistical analysis of the text, conclude that the unity of Zechariah 9–11 with Zechariah 1–8 is "likely," but the unity of Zechariah 12–14 with 1–11 is "improbable."

has sought to relate the oracles to certain post-Exilic *events* which have absolute historical dates and stipulate a definite chronology (see Hill 1981, pp. 11–25). On the other hand, the linguistic analysis characteristic of the typological method seeks to relate Zechariah 9–14 to other pieces of post-Exilic (as well as pre-Exilic and Exilic) *literature*. I have deliberately avoided the several acknowledged chronological complexities of the post-Exilic period. The emphasis here is rather on chronological relationships within the framework of the relative dating schematic yielded by linguistic analysis. Fortunately, in the case of the post-Exilic prophets, this gap between relative and absolute dating is minimized by the exact dates of Haggai and Zechariah 1–8.

Since Polzin structured his research method for the analysis of biblical Hebrew prose, it is necessary to establish that Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi are indeed prose, so as to avoid the pitfalls of comparing dissimilar materials. This is particularly apropos in light of the recent study of F. I. Andersen and D. N. Freedman (1980, pp. 57–66). They conclude from "prose-particle" counts of individual chapters that Hosea is a mixture of varying degrees of prose and poetry, a mixture of a type which appears to be characteristic of the 8th century Hebrew prophets. However, the problem of prose-poetry discrimination is by no means a simple one and I would concur with J. Hoftijzer (1965, p. 50) who states that

> the boundaries of what is poetry are not easy to delimit, as we are very badly informed about the nature of Hebrew poetry. We know practically nothing with any certainty about the accentuation, the metre, the rhythm or any other system whereby poetry was differentiated from ordinary prose.

In his monograph on the particle *'et*, Hoftijzer traces its use through most of the Hebrew Bible. Based upon his analysis of *'et* syntagmemes (i.e. the particle *'et* and the word or group of words following it), Hoftijzer (1965, pp. 76–77) concludes that Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, and Malachi, at least in respect to their density of *'et* syntagmemes, are "comparable to [prose] narrative material." Concerning Zechariah 9–14, Hoftijzer (1965, p. 77) states that "we can conclude that in Deutero-Zechariah the *'et* syntagmeme density is like that of narrative [prose] material, with the exception of Zech. ix where it agrees with that in poetic material."[3]

3. Hoftijzer counts 18 *'t* syntagmemes of six different types (cf. Hoftijzer, 1965, p. 52) in Haggai (1:14[3]; 2:3[2],5,6[4],7[2],11,17[3], 21[2]); he counts 54 *'t* syntagmemes in Zechariah 1–8 (1:6,11,12,13; 2:1, etc.); 45 *'t* syntagmemes are noted in Zechariah 10–14 (10:3[3], 6[2]; 11:4,9,10[2],13,14; 12:2,3; 13:9, etc.); and 35 *'t* syntagmemes were found in Malachi (1:3[2],6; 2:2[2],3,4,9,13; 3:2,3[2], 11, etc.). Unfortunately Hoftijzer does not cite references for all examples in the selected texts. He concludes that the post-Exilic prophets are prose similar to narrative materials (with the exception of Zechariah 9) because the density of *'t* syntagmemes in these texts corresponds to that demonstrated in Old Testament narrative materials (approximately 4 or 5% of the entire text).

In the main, this treatment is corroborated by an analysis of the post-Exilic prophets based on the "prose-particle" counting method of Andersen and Freedman (1980, pp. 57–66). Here the total number of occurrences of the Hebrew particles *'et, 'ăšer*, and the definite article are set in proportion to the total number of words per chapter of a given text. In general, these particles are typical of Hebrew prose and atypical of Hebrew poetry. According to Andersen and Freedman (1980, p. 60), the frequency of these particles is high in prose (on a percentage basis, 15% or more of all words), while the frequency of these particles in poetry is much lower (5% or less of all words). Haggai, Zechariah 1–8 and 10–14, and Malachi demonstrate "prose-particle" frequencies very near or above 15%, while Zechariah 9 yields a "prose-particle" frequency of less than 4%.[4] Given this additional evidence, it would seem safe to conclude that Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, and Malachi are representative of Hebrew prose, while Second Zechariah appears to be a mixture of poetry (chapter 9) and prose (chapters 10–14). For this reason I have opted to include only the prose sections (chapters 10–14) in my linguistic analysis of Second Zechariah.

II

In his book *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, R. Polzin attempts to characterize and classify several major stages of biblical Hebrew on the basis of nineteen different grammatical and syntactic categories. By systematically applying these nineteen categories to selected texts Polzin seeks to differentiate early biblical Hebrew from late biblical Hebrew on a relative chronological scale. The focal point of Polzin's research (the unknown as it were) is the

4. The data for the definite article, for *'et*, and for *'ăšer* yield a prose particle count in Haggai 1 of 23.5% (47 of 200 words) and 21.8% in Haggai 2 (85 of 390 words); for Zechariah 1–8, these data yield a prose particle count of 19.6% in Zechariah 1 (47 of 240 words), 16.3% in Zechariah 2 (31 of 190 words), 18.9% in Zechariah 3 (27 of 143 words), 18.5% in Zechariah 4 (30 of 162 words), 23.4% in Zechariah 5 (32 of 137 words), 17.9% in Zechariah 6 (32 of 179 words), 20.1% in Zechariah 7 (34 of 162 words), and 34.1% in Zechariah 8 (74 of 217 words); for Zechariah 9–14, these data yield a prose particle count of 3.5% in Zechariah 9 (13 of 370 words), 16.1% in Zechariah 10 (24 of 149 words), 24.8% in Zechariah 11 (55 of 222 words), 22.1% in Zechariah 12 (42 of 190 words), 22.2% in Zechariah 13 (30 of 135 words), and 29.1% in Zechariah 14 (89 of 306 words); for Malachi, these data yield a prose particle count of 11.4% in Malachi 1 (24 of 210 words), 15.4% in Malachi 2 (37 of 241 words), and 20.4% in Malachi 3 (67 of 328 words). These word counts for the post-Exilic prophets are based on the less technical definition of a word as utilized by Andersen & Freedman (1980, pp. 57–66), which essentially is a group of characters separated from another group of characters by a blank space (or by the punctuation mark [:]).

portion of the Hebrew Bible traditionally called the Priestly Document (or P). Of the four recognized strands of P (the base text P^g, its supplement P^s, the Lawcode P^l, and the Holiness Code P^h), Polzin concentrates on the bulk of the largest two, P^g and P^s (see Polzin 1976, pp. 85–90). In addition, in establishing the pre-Exilic end of his continuum, Polzin utilizes selections from the Pentateuchal parts of the Yahwist and Elohist traditions (JE), the Court History (CH, roughly 2 Samuel 13-1 Kings 1), and the Deuteronomist (Dtr, i.e. the framework of Deuteronomy and parts of the Deuteronomic History); the post-Exilic part of his continuum is keyed to the nonsynoptic portions of Chronicles (Chr), all of Ezra (Ezr), the memoir portions of Nehemiah (N^1), the non-memoir portions of Nehemiah (N^2), and all of Esther (Est).[5]

Polzin analyzes these corpora linguistically for the purpose of determining whether the distinction of P versus non-P is a valid one, and whether a grammatical-syntactic characterization of the delineated corpora can yield criteria sufficient for the establishment of a dating scheme which exhibits the relative chronological relationship of each corpus, with an emphasis on the position of the "unknowns," P^g and P^s. In each case the research of Polzin offered an affirmative answer. Granted this fact, it is reasonable to assume the methodology will yield criteria sufficient for the establishment of a relative dating scheme when applied to other texts as well.

The nineteen diagnostic grammatical and syntactic features of late biblical Hebrew (LBH) developed by Polzin for the linguistic analysis of biblical Hebrew prose are listed below. According to Polzin, the nonsynoptic portions of the Books of Chronicles represent the best example of LBH, and Polzin's nineteen categories were largely developed on the basis of the language of the Chronicler (see Polzin 1976, pp. 1–2; cf. similar categories in Kropat's [1909] classic work on Chronicles). The nineteen categories are recorded here in Polzin's system of enumeration:

A. Features of late biblical Hebrew (LBH) not attributable to Aramaic influence.
   1. Radically reduced use of *'et* with pronominal suffix.
   2. Increased use of *'et* before a noun in the nominative case: *'et* emphatic.
   3. Expression of possession by prospective pronominal suffix with a following noun, or *lə* plus noun or *šel* plus noun.
   4. Collectives are construed as plurals almost without exception.
   5. A preference for plural forms of words and phrases which the earlier languages uses in the singular.
   6. The use of an infinitive absolute in immediate connection with a finite

5. See Polzin (1976, pp. 27–28, 70–75, and 85–122) or Hill (1981, pp. 26–34) for a detailed catalog of the contents of each of the delineated corpora.

verb of the same stem is almost completely lacking in the Chronicler; the infinitive absolute used as a command is not found at all in Chronicles.

7. The Chronicler's use of the infinitive construct with *bə*, and *kə*: as Segal (1927) points out, the later books of the OT show less frequent use of the infinitive construct with *bə* and *kə*; even in the cases when LBH does use the introductory infinitive with *bə*, and *kə*, the usage is different from earlier constructions.
8. Repetition of a singular word = Latin *quivis* (to express distributive).
9. The Chronicler shows a merging (i.e., a tendency to replace) the third feminine plural suffix with the third masculine plural suffix.
10. The first person singular imperfect with *-āh* (the lengthened imperfect or cohortative) is found but once in the Chronicler's language.
11. The use of *wayhî* greatly recedes in Chronicles and in the younger language.
12. In appositional relationship the Chronicler prefers to place the substantive before the numeral and almost always puts it in the plural; this is contrary to the older practice of putting the number first.
13. The Chronicler shows an increased use of the infinitive construct with *lə*.

B. Features of late biblical Hebrew (LBH) attributable to Aramaic influence.

1. In citing material and its weight or measure, the Chronicler often has the order, material weighed or measured + its weight or measure (+ number).
2. *lə* is used often as a mark of the accusative.
3. In *min* 'from', the *nun* is often not assimilated before a noun without an article.
4. The Chronicler uses the emphatic *lə* before the last element of a list.
5. In an attributive usage, *rabbîm* is twice placed before the substantive.
6. The use of *'ad lə*, [for 'up to', 'until'].

The purpose in distinguishing the A and B classes is "not only to describe a certain feature as late, but to attempt also to further describe its nature" (Polzin 1976, pp. 9–10). Polzin pursues this distinction in the nature of LBH features as a result of his interest in determining whether or not a given feature represents a proto-mishnaic or mishnaic characteristic. The differentiation of Aramaic and mishnaic features important for his study will not be a part of the analysis of the post-Exilic prophets. The presence of a given LBH feature means an overwhelming presence in the text under consideration, perhaps with occasional exceptions. Unique features, those linguistic categories rendering data deviating radically from the expected norm in the selected texts, are also noted.

Polzin's research can be summarized by the following continuum of biblical Hebrew which he offers as a result of his systematic application of the nineteen aforementioned grammatical and syntactic categories to

the specified corpora (note that corpora with slashes are more or less homogeneous).

JE/CH/Dtr	P^g	P^s	Chr	Ezr/N^2	N^1	Est

JE/CH/Dtr: twelve stable features of classical BH are present (*contra* A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5, A.6, A.7, A.8, A.9/B.1, A.11, A.12, A.13).

P^g: four features of LBH are present (A.3, A.4, A.6, A.9); seven features of classical BH remain (*contra* A.2, A.5, A.7, A.8, A.11, A.12, B.1).

P^s: eight features of LBH present (A.2, A.3, A.4, A.7, A.9, A.11, A.12, B.1); two features of classical BH remain (*contra* A.5, A.8).

Chr: thirteen features of LBH are present (A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5, A.6, A.7, A.8, A.9, A.11, A.12, A.13, B.1); no features of classical BH remain.

Ezr/N^2: ten features of LBH are present (Ezr: A.3, A.4, A.5, A.6, A.7, A.8, A.9, A.11, A.12, B.1; N^2: A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5, A.6, A.7, A.11, A.12, B.1); no features of classical BH remain.

N^1: eight features of LBH are present (A.3, A.5, A.6, A.8, A.9, A.12, A.13, B.1); six features of classical BH are present (whether they remain or, as Polzin would have it, reappear) (*contra* A.1, A.2, A.4, A.7, A.11, A.12).

Est: six features of LBH are present (A.1, A.5, A.7, A.8, A.13, B.2); six features of classical BH are present (whether they remain or, as Polzin would have it, reappear) (*contra* A.4, A.6, A.9, A.11, A.12, B.1).

These data prompt Polzin (1976, p. 112) to conclude that classical BH seems to have remained generally stable for a considerable period of time. It seems probable from the data presented that the grammatical/syntactic nature of P^g and P^s places them between classical BH and the LBH of Chronicles. Moreover, the data suggest that P^s is typologically later than P^g.

Polzin (1976, p. 74) also claims that the presence of classical BH features in N^1 and Est is attributable to the "marked tendency toward archaizing" in the later stages of the post-Exilic period. This tendency culminated in the "neo-classical" writings of Qumran which "are archaistic attempts at classical Hebrew which are betrayed by late Aramaisms, 'proto-mishnaic' features, and LBH features" (Polzin 1976, p. 7). I shall return to this point of his treatment below.

Before proceeding with my own analysis of the post-Exilic prophets it is necessary to pause here and enumerate several of the problems and inconsistencies in Polzin's *Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, since my research rests squarely on his linguistic foundation. My purpose is not to denigrate Polzin's study, rather this minimal criticism serves to illustrate

that no system or methodology is completely free of defects. Furthermore, the acknowledgment of deficiencies inherent to this particular linguistic approach not only functions as a "qualifier" for my tentative conclusions in respect to the chronological relationship of the post-Exilic prophets; but also these deficiencies serve as "guideposts" for those who would follow up this exploratory study with a more sophisticated linguistic analysis of the biblical text.

A glaring flaw in Polzin's research (and hence this study) is the very superficial relationship of the linguistic method utilized in the analysis of the biblical text to the underlying tenets of historical linguistics. This is due, in part, to the interdisciplinary nature of the study. One must not only control data in biblical studies (specifically language and history), but also in linguistics (including historical linguistics) and statistics. Though I have made an effort to be sensitive to the shortcomings of Polzin's analytic method in respect to the broader principles of historical linguistics by supplementing his research on occasion, my study admittedly suffers in this same vein as well.

Closely connected with Polzin's failure to relate his study to historical linguistics in general is his reluctance or inability to associate linguistic change, or the lack of it, with historical development. A case in point is Polzin's conclusion regarding the similarity of his JE, CH and Dtr samplings of which he says, "classical BH seems to have remained generally stable for a considerable period of time" (1976, p. 112).

Polzin omits any rationale for the phenomenon and apparently recognizes no correlation between the stability of classical biblical Hebrew and the nature of historical change in ancient Israel; when in fact, the student of history would anticipate, even predict, the occurrence of such a phenomenon based on an understanding of comparative historical development in ancient Israel.[6]

I have attempted to counter this deficiency of Polzin's research by including a hypothetical reconstruction of the development of biblical Hebrew in the Exilic and post-Exilic periods given the data rendered by the linguistic analysis of the select corpora.

6. The extended stability of classical Hebrew is a direct reflection of Israelite practice during what G. E. Mendenhall terms the *traditional period* of Israelite religion and history. This traditional period may be defined as "one in which the primary task of the community is felt to be the preservation and transmission of a tradition which was necessary to the preservation of the group" (Mendenhall, 1961, p. 45). In this case the community (i.e. the political power structures of the monarchies between 920 and 586 b.c.) preserved not only the tradition necessary for preservation of the group, but also the form in which it was transmitted, more specifically the Hebrew language. It should be noted here that this criticism in no way detracts from the thesis of the linguistic methodology, only the extended application of the methodology to the process of historical development.

Statistically Polzin's categorical data are woefully inadequate. One example of this statistical deficiency is Polzin's method of counting verses per text, which is undoubtedly a most imprecise method of gauging the materials in question. A better method would have been the counting of number of lines per text, since verse length varies considerably from text to text. Of course, the most efficient way to enumerate the contents of selected texts is to compute the number of words per text—whatever one determines a "word" to be.

A second statistical defect of Polzin's research is his failure to normalize the length of the text samplings by intentional design or statistical projection. The incorporation of these two procedures would have served to standardize the materials under investigation and would have resulted in the more consistent correlation of data, making the consequent ratios more precise. Polzin's failure to incorporate these procedures into his analysis has rendered some of the data irrelevant for the determination of chronological distinctions.[7]

Unlike Polzin, I have based my analysis of the post-Exilic prophets on word-samplings per text rather than verse-samplings per text.[8] For comparative purposes I have expanded Polzin's work where possible by statistically projecting his data, clarifying and supplementing his ratios and figures whenever possible, and also through the incorporation of statistical projections of diagnostic analysis of the post-Exilic prophetic texts.

Finally, large portions of my analysis are based on the computations of Radday (1973). To ensure uniformity in each of the corpora, the individual texts of the post-Exilic prophets have been treated *in toto*, that is, without deletions (of so-called "obvious late additions"; cf. Andersen & Freedman 1980, pp. 57–77) or emendations of the basic text found in *BHK* (and supplemented when necessary by the readings of the more recent *BHS*). This, coupled with the word-samplings per text method of computing text content, lends greater precision to the linguistic analysis and increased accuracy and reliability of the statistical data, features which are crucial given the limited sample sizes of the selected texts.

More specifically, a third problem in Polzin's analysis is his inconsistent application of the diagnostic categories to his complete list of control corpora. Esther is analyzed only in conjunction with Chronicles and Ezra/Nehemiah. Neither Esther, Daniel, nor Ben Sirach is included on the

7. Cf. categories A.6 and A.13 in Section III below.

8. Following Parunak (1979, pp. 22–23), for the purposes of this study a "word" is any morpheme (i.e. "a minimal, meaningful, recurrent unit of language. Roughly speaking, nouns, verbs, pronouns [including genitive and accusative suffixes], prepositions and conjunctions are words, while the definite article, the plural morpheme, and nominative pronominal suffixes are not").

biblical Hebrew continuum with which Polzin (1976, pp. 112–15) concludes his study. The same holds true for the analysis of individual grammatical and syntactic categories. Certain categories (e.g. A.1 and A.8) are applied to the entire range of control corpora, while other categories are applied only to selected corpora (e.g. A.5 and A.6) or to Chronicles alone (A.7). This lack of completeness and consistency in analysis leads to distortion and misrepresentation of the categorical data.[9]

I have tried to overcome these problems in my analysis by the complete application of the diagnostic categories to the selected control and target corpora, as well as by supplementing Polzin's incomplete data where possible, and also by the inclusion of the memoir portions of Nehemiah (N^1) and Esther (Est) on the biblical Hebrew continuum.

Lastly, some mention must be made of the problematic nature of several of Polzin's grammatical and syntactic categories. For example, A.1 is also true of early Hebrew poetry (cf. Gesenius, 1976, §2q-s and 117a–11). So what is true of early poetry is also true of late prose, perhaps necessitating a poetry/prose distinction in the texts under investigation. A.2 is rare at best and may not constitute a valid criterion for the characterization of biblical Hebrew. A.5 is based only on a sampling of ten select words and phrases.[10] A.9 is characteristic of all biblical Hebrew regardless of date (cf. Gesenius, 1976, §59a–60h). A.13 does not yield any significant distinctions between early and late biblical Hebrew due to the inexactness of Polzin's verse counting method. Further, B.3 is also true of archaic Hebrew (e.g. Exod 18:14; Num 23:7; Josh 11:21; Judg 5:20, 10:11, and 19:16), and finally, B.5 is of such a restricted nature that the comparative utility of the category is negligible.

Despite the deficiencies of Polzin's research demonstrated in this brief critique, he should be credited for attempting to solve a difficult problem,

9. One example of incompleteness that proves misleading is Polzin's reference to the use of *'ittîm* in Est 1:13 (an example of A.5). According to Polzin (p. 75), "another late feature in Esther is the appearance of the plural *'ittîm*." Coupling this with other examples, Polzin implies that Esther must then be dated later than Chronicles and Ezra/Nehemiah. However, Polzin makes no mention of the use of the plural *'ittîm* in Neh 9:28; 10:35; 13:31; Ezr 10:14; or 1 Chr 12:32; 29:30 and 2 Chr 15:5. When the full distribution of this feature is taken into consideration, Esther represents no significant divergence from Chronicles and Ezra/Nehemiah.

10. See Hill (1981, pp. 84ff.) for a survey of the distribution of commonly recognized LBH words, phrases and idioms in the post-Exilic prophets. These 100 LBH lexical items were compiled from studies by Polzin (1976, pp. 121–58) and Hurvitz (1974a and 1974b) and they represent an attempt to supplement the linguistic analysis of Polzin with systematic lexical research.

one basic to biblical studies, with a new and workable approach. In addition, even though a pioneering work is experimental and problematic by its very nature, this in no way discounts the merit of Polzin's study in establishing linguistic criteria that are superior to all former methods for the analysis of the Hebrew text for the developmental patterns of classical Hebrew. This new approach has the dual advantage of providing a different perspective and context in which to view previous data, and at the same time possesses the potential to yield new data that may supplement the present state of knowledge on the subject in question. I would also concur with Polzin in that the linguistic method, with its statistical nature due to the grammatical/syntactic categorical approach, offers a far more systematic and objective method for the analysis of the biblical text. The weight of these two considerations makes Polzin's linguistic method an attractive and viable alternative to the options currently available in biblical studies for textual analysis—and constitutes my rationale for its adaptation to the chronological complexities related to the post-Exilic prophetic books of Haggai, First and Second Zechariah, and Malachi.

III

The texts under investigation include the target corpus of Zechariah 10–14 (73 verses and 1617 words), and the control corpora of Haggai (38 verses and 822 words) and Zechariah 1–8 (121 verses and 2465 words), as well as the post-Exilic prophetic text of Malachi (54 verses and 1255 words), and the corpora analyzed by Polzin. The restricted size of the text samples constitutes the fundamental problem of the present study. Unfortunately, there is no more text with which to work; nonetheless all conclusions must be balanced against the very limited target and control corpora size.

Keeping this caveat in mind, as well as the foundation laid in the previous paragraphs, I shall proceed with the linguistic analysis of the post-Exilic prophets via the nineteen diagnostic categories developed by Polzin for the characterization of classical biblical Hebrew prose. The raw data gleaned from this analysis are included below for the reader's convenience.[11]

11. Cf. Hill (1981, pp. 38–83).

A.1 Radically reduced use of *'et* with pronominal suffix.

The findings of Polzin may be summarized in this manner:

JE—12/7 in favor of the verbal suffix
CH— 2/1 in favor of the verbal suffix
Dtr—12/7 in favor of the verbal suffix
P^g—marked preference for *'et* with suffix
P^s—marked preference for *'et* with suffix
Chr—10/1 in favor of the verbal suffix
Ezr— 5/1 in favor of the verbal suffix
N^2—23/0 in favor of the verbal suffix
N^1— 4/1 in favor of the verbal suffix

For comparative purposes, I have expanded Polzin's ratios since they are unclear and imprecise due to the uneven totals of the texts included in the selected corpora. The statistically projected ratios (based on a 1000-verse sampling) will help to balance Polzin's figures and will aid in the retrieval of more accurate data from which to draw conclusions. Polzin's adjusted statistics read:

JE—49 vbsf/27 *'t* in 216 vss or 1.81/1 per 1000 vss
CH—50 vbsf/25 *'t* in 308 vss or 2.00/1 per 1000 vss
Dtr—67 vbsf/41 *'t* in 269 vss or 1.63/1 per 1000 vss
P^g—51 vbsf/103 *'t* in 678 vss or 2.01/1 per 1000 vss
(in favor of *'t* with suffix over the verbal suffix)
P^s—23 vbsf/91 *'t* in 578 vss or 3.90/1 per 1000 vss
(in favor of *'t* with suffix over the verbal suffix)
Chr—141 vbsf/14 *'t* in 1026 vss or 10.07/1 per 1000 vss
Ezr—16 vbsf/3 *'t* in 210 vss or 5.33/1 per 1000 vss
N^2—23 vbsf/0 *'t* in 220 vss
N^1—35 vbsf/8 *'t* in 177 vss or 4.37/1 per 1000 vss

To these figures compare the results of a similar analysis of the post-Exilic prophets:

Hag—7 vbsf/3 *'t* in 38 vss or 2.33/1 per 1000 vss
Zech 1–8—15 vbsf/8 *'t* in 121 vss or 1.87/1 per 1000 vss
Zech 10–14—25 vbsf/6 *'t* in 73 vss or 4.16/1 per 1000 vss
Mal—17 vbsf/12 *'t* in 55 vss or 1.30/1 per 1000 vss

These figures clearly indicate, except in the case of P^g and P^s, that the samples examined prefer verbal suffixes over objective *'et* with suffix. They also demonstrate the decrease in frequency of usage of the objective *'et* with suffix from the earlier to the later language, as observed by Polzin. Here, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8 and Malachi exhibit ratios similar to the

ratios of Polzin's JE, CH and Dtr, whereas Zechariah 10–14 demonstrates a ratio more closely aligned with Ezra and Nehemiah[1].

A.2 Increased use of *'et* before a noun in the nominative case: *'et* emphatic.

Polzin (1976, p. 35) cites thirty-nine occurrences of this feature in the OT "of which thirty-one are most probable of sixth century provenance or later." In commenting on the distribution of this feature in the OT, Polzin (p. 37) says, "It seems likely that it was a very rare feature of Classical Hebrew which grew in popularity so that in the sixth-fourth centuries it began to be used much more than earlier."

In addition to the two instances recorded by Polzin, it would appear that the post-Exilic prophets contain no other examples of *'et* emphatic. Polzin's statistics for this feature are as follows:

Chr—6 occurrences in 1026 vss or 5.84 per 1000 vss
N[2]—4 occurrences in 220 vss or 18.16 per 1000 vss

Utilizing the two examples in the post-Exilic prophets cited by Polzin (only Hag 2:17 and Zech 7:7), the post-Exilic prophets compare in this way:

Hag—1 occurrence in 38 vss or 26.3 per 1000 vss or 1.21 per 1000 words
Zech 1–8—1 occurrence in 121 vss or 8.26 per 1000 vss or .405 per 1000 words

Since none of the other examples of the *'et* emphatic occur within the confines of any of the delineated control corpora it is difficult to determine what actually constitutes an increase in the use of the *'et* emphatic from earlier periods. Technically, Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 do show a decrease in the use of the *'et* emphatic since the ratios exhibited in the two prophets are greater than those of Chronicles and Nehemiah[2]. However, this is misleading because the *'et* emphatic is a rare feature, not to mention the restricted nature of the corpora in question.

A.3 Expression of possession by prospective pronominal suffix with a following noun, or *lə* plus noun or *šel* plus noun.

As understood by Polzin, the post-Exilic prophets contain no examples of this feature of late biblical Hebrew.

A.4 Collectives are construed as plurals almost without exception.

Following Kropat (1909, pp. 28–29) and Brockelmann (1913, II, pp. 178–79), Polzin (p. 41) states, "This feature is much more common in

LBH than before." According to Polzin's computations the Chronicler construes collectives as plurals in twenty-five of the twenty-seven cases isolated. Collectives are construed as plurals in 1 Chr 9:1 (2), 13:4; 15:28a; 29:9, 17,20,23; 2 Chr 7:14; 12:3; 13:15; 15:15; 17:5; 20:4,27; 21:19; 29:28, 31; 30:3,13,23,25; 32:4,8; 33:17. The two exceptions occur in 2 Chr 20:24 and 30:18. Polzin also includes two cases where parallel passages construed as singular in the earlier sources are regarded as plural in the Chronicler (2 Sam 23:11b and 1 Chr 11:13; 2 Kgs 11:20 and 2 Chr 23:21).

In the post-Exilic prophets, Haggai construes the collective as a plural in three cases (1:2,12,14) and as a singular in one instance (1:12). Zechariah 1–8 construes four collectives (2:8,17; 7:2; 8:3) as singular, and of the five collectives in Zechariah 10–14, four are viewed as singular (12:6; 14:2, 8,14) and one as a plural (10:7). In Malachi, three collectives are noted (1:4; 2:11 [2]), and none is understood as plural.

A.5 A preference for plural forms of words and phrases which the earlier language uses in the singular.

Polzin isolates ten different Hebrew words and phrases which are construed as singulars in the early language and as plurals in the later-language. These ten are: *gôrālôt, mispərê, pəsāḥîm, bəqārîm, 'ittîm, 'abnê qəlā'îm, 'anšê šemôt, gibbôrê (ha)ḥayālîm, 'ārê (ham)məṣûrôt, ḥārāšê 'ēṣîm.*

The only example of post-Exilic prophetic usage of these terms is the occurrence of *'abnê qela'* in verse 15 of the poetic material of Zechariah 9 (cf. *'abnê qəlā'îm* in 2 Chr 26:14).

A.6. The use of an infinitive absolute in immediate connection with a finite verb of the same stem is almost completely lacking in the Chronicler; the infinitive absolute used as a command is not found at all in Chronicles.

According to Polzin (pp. 43–44), the general trend in the younger language is toward the dissolution of the infinitive absolute. Yet Polzin's P^g corpus yields a lower density than the control corpora of Chronicles, even though Polzin concludes that P^g must precede Chronicles chronologically. The discrepancies in Polzin's analysis may be blamed, at least in part, on his failure to pro-rate the evidence retrieved from the various control corpora analyzed. Keeping this fact in mind, an examination of the data Polzin produces on the usage of the infinitive absolute is recorded below:

JE—1 (inf ab) per 15.4 vss
CH—1 (inf ab) per 19 vss
Dtr—1 (inf ab) per 54 vss
P^g—1 (inf ab) per 136 vss
Chr—1 (inf ab) per 93 vss

Polzin's data are presented in a most haphazard and unsystematic format, but more than this, in reality it reveals very little about the true nature of the specific usage of the infinitive absolute in these texts because the corpora are not uniform in regard to length. For a more accurate picture of the usage of the infinitive absolute in these texts, I have systematically expanded Polzin's data by using a context of usage per 1000 verses of text. This injects some consistency (and certainly more meaning) into Polzin's figures, and proves beneficial for comparative purposes with the figures resulting from the analysis of the post-Exilic prophets. Polzin's expanded data read as follows:

JE—14 inf ab in 216 vss or 64.82 per 1000 vss
CH—16 inf ab in 308 vss or 51.36 per 1000 vss
Dtr—5 inf ab in 269 vss or 18.55 per 1000 vss
P^g—5 inf ab in 678 vss or 7.35 per 1000 vss
Chr—11 inf ab in 1026 vss or 10.71 per 1000 vss

The post-Exilic prophets yield these ratios:

Hag—7 inf ab in 38 vss or 184.1 per 1000 vss or 8.47 per 1000 words
Zech 1–8—9 inf ab in 121 vss or 74.34 per 1000 vss or 3.65 per 1000 words
Zech 10–14—7 inf ab in 73 vss or 95.89 per 1000 vss or 4.33 per 1000 words
Mal—1 inf ab in 55 vss or 18.10 per 1000 vss or .80 per 1000 words

In the main, these figures support Polzin's generalization of a gradual reduction in the usage of the infinitive absolute, the exception being the P^g corpus. These figures also seem to indicate that the tendency toward dissolution of the infinitive absolute is not yet present in the post-Exilic prophets.

Polzin (p. 44) points out that Chronicles contains but two examples of the infinitive absolute used in connection with a finite verb of the same stem (1 Chr 4:10; 2 Chr 28:19). Unfortunately, Polzin declines to provide evidence from the other corpora for comparative purposes other than to say that the feature does not occur in Ecclesiastes, Ezra, or Daniel. A projected rendering of Polzin's scanty data reads:

Ezr—0 inf ab/fin vb in 210 vss
Chr—2 inf ab/fin vb in 1026 vss or 1.95 per 1000 vss

The infinitive absolute occurs seven times in Haggai (1:6 [5], 9[2]), nine times in Zechariah 1–8 (3:4; 6:5,10,15; 7:3,5,11,12; 8:21), seven times in Zechariah 10–14 (11:17[2]; 12:3,10[2]; 13:4; 14:12), and once in Malachi (2:16). Of these twenty-four occurrences, five are used in conjunction with a finite verb of the same stem, and all are found in Zechariah (*šāmô'a tišmə'ûn* in 6:15, *nēlkāh hālôk* in 8:21, *yābôš tîbaš* and *kāhoh tikheh* in 11:17; and *śārôṭ yiśśārēṭû* in 12:3). The corresponding ratios read:

Hag—0 inf ab/fin vb in 38 vss
Zech 1–8—2 inf ab/fin vb in 121 vss or 16.52 per 1000 vss or .81 per 1000 words
Zech 10–14—3 inf ab/fin vb in 73 vss or 41.09 per 1000 vss or 1.84 per 1000 words
Mal—0 inf ab/fin vb in 55 vss

According to Polzin (p. 43), the infinitive absolute used as a command is absent in Chronicles. This is also true of Haggai, Zechariah 10–14, and Malachi; it is found twice in Zechariah 1–8 (3:4 and 6:10).

A.7 The Chronicler's use of the infinitive construct with *bə* and *kə*.

As Segal (1927) points out, the later books on the OT show a less frequent use of the infinitive construct with *bə* and *kə*, and even in the cases when LBH does use the introductory infinitive construct with *bə* and *kə*, the usage is different from earlier constructions.

For comparative purposes, Polzin uses only meager evidence to establish his case. He examines only Kings and Chronicles, and then he chooses only four verbal stems for statistical considerations (*šāma'*, *rā'āh*, *kālāh* and *bô'*). Polzin cites forty-one occurrences of the infinitive with *bə* and *kə* in Kings in the above-mentioned stems, but only thirteen such cases in Chronicles. Polzin computes a ratio of 41/13, which he views as "impressive," but in fact it tells one very little about the true nature of the usage of the infinitive construct due to the limited scope of the analysis.

The infinitive construct with *bə* and *kə* occurs in the post-Exilic prophets in Hag 2:5; Zech 7:7, 8:14, 13:3,4,9(2); and Mal 1:7,12, 2:17, and 3:2. Analysis of these corpora yields the subsequent ratios:

Hag—1 in 38 vss or 26.3 per 1000 vss or 1.21 per 1000 words
Zech 1–8—2 in 121 vss or 16.52 per 1000 vss or .81 per 1000 words
Zech 10–14—4 in 73 vss or 54.79 per 1000 vss or 2.47 per 1000 words
Mal—4 in 55 vss or 72.4 per 1000 vss or 3.18 per 100 words

A.8 Repetition of a singular word = Latin *quivis* (to express distributive).

S. R. Driver (1922, p. 538) noticed this particular feature of late biblical Hebrew some years ago. Polzin (p. 47) expands and refines Driver's observations, and isolates four significant aspects of the feature:

a) singular noun + *wə* + singular noun (e.g. 1 Chr 28:14,15; Ezr 10:14; Neh 13:24; Est 1:8,22, 2:12, 3:4, 9:28)
b) *lə* + singular noun + *lə* + singular noun (e.g. 1 Chr 9:27, 29:5)
c) *lə* + singular noun + *wə* + singular noun (e.g. 1 Chr 26:13, 28:16,17; 2 Chr 8:14, 19:5, 35:15)
d) *kol* + singular noun + *wə* + singular noun (e.g. Est 2:11, 3:14, 4:3, 8:11, 13, 17, 9:21, 27)

Turning to the post-Exilic prophets, one finds four potential *quivis* constructions: Hag 1:6 (*wəhammiśtakkēr miśtakkēr*), Zech 2:10 (*hôy hôy*), Zech 12:12 (*miśpāḥôt miśpāḥôt*) and Zech 12:14 (*miśpāḥōt miśpaḥōt*). The reference in Hag 1:6 should probably be read with the variant *yśtkr* following *wəhammiśtakkēr* (cf. *BHS*). Even if the text is read as it stands, this *quivis* construction with a participle is unlike those of LBH and does not have the distributive meaning of 'each', 'every', 'several' in this context. Similarly, the repetition of the interjection *hôy* does not fit the specifications either of structure or meaning of the LBH *quivis* construction. Only Zech 12:12 and 12:14 seem to parallel the other examples of the LBH *quivis* constructions cited by Polzin. In these two cases, the connecting *waw* is missing so the form of the construction does not correspond exactly to any of the multiforms of Polzin. However, the sense coincides with the distributive meaning of the *quivis* construction in LBH, that is 'each' or 'every'.

A.9 The Chronicler shows a merging [i.e. a tendency to replace] the third feminine plural suffix with the third masculine plural suffix.

This phenomenon is not restricted to the language of the Chronicler, and Polzin's arguments may be somewhat misleading here. Polzin does cite other occurrences of the feature (e.g. Dan 1:5, 8:9; Ruth 1:8,22), but gives no true indication of the pervasive nature of the feature in question in biblical Hebrew. Polzin's research indicates that only two third feminine plural suffixes occur in Chronicles (1 Chr 21:10 and 2 Chr 18:16), and these are passages in which the parallel text has the third masculine plural

suffix. Since there is a total absence of the third feminine plural suffix in the Chronicler's own language, Polzin (p. 53) maintains "we may safely assume that the source used by the Chronicler had the third feminine plural suffix."

On the basis of the language of the Chronicler, Polzin concludes that the final *nun* was lost in Hebrew through a merging with the masculine plural *mem*. Unlike Kropat (1909, p. 74), however, Polzin does not attribute this merging to Aramaic influence. Since Gesenius (1976, §132, 144, and 145) clearly demonstrates that this merging of the third feminine plural suffix with the third masculine plural suffix is characteristic of all biblical Hebrew, the question then becomes one of degree rather than fact.

An examination of the post-Exilic prophets reveals the third masculine plural suffix occurs 6 times in Haggai; 64 times in Zechariah; and 8 times in Malachi. The third feminine plural suffix is found once in Zechariah 1–8 (5:9) and five times in Zechariah 10–14 (11:2,3,4,16; 14:12). The third feminine plural suffix does not occur in Haggai or Malachi.[12]

Though some suffix merging is present in the post-Exilic prophets (something not out of the ordinary), it is not comparable to the extensive merging found in the Chronicler. Use of the feminine plural suffix in Zechariah indicates that the form was still understood and functional in the early post-Exilic period.

A.10 The first person singular imperfect with *-āh* (the lengthened imperfect or cohortative) is found but once in the Chronicler's language.

Polzin uncovers only one occurrence of the cohortative (or lengthened imperfect) in Chronicles, that being *'ākînāh* in 1 Chr 22:5. According to Polzin (p. 54), the related imperfect consecutive lengthened form is also

12. In Hag 2:16, *mihyôtām* is problematic. Reading the text one might expect *mihyôtān* if the antecedent is *'eben* in 2:15. However, the text is usually emended to a second person form of some type (e.g. *mah-heyyitem*) thus negating any question of suffix merging in the third person. In Zech 5:6, there appears to be an example of this suffix merging. The phrase *zo't 'ênām* 'their eyes' (or 'their iniquity' [*'awonām*] according to the LXX and Syriac) seemingly has *hā'êpāh* as its antecedent and thus one would expect *zō't 'ênān*. If, however, 'their eyes' refers to those who commit iniquity in 5:1–4 (so Keil, 1975, X/2, p. 283), then the third masculine plural suffix is perfectly consistent. In Zech 11:5, a clear example of suffix merging occurs. Here a series of four feminine plural suffixes is interrupted by the masculine plural *wərō'ehem*. One would expect *wərō'ehen*, thus completing the series *qōnêhen . . . yahargun . . . umōkrêhen . . . 'ālêhen*, all referring to the *'et-sō'n hahărēgāh* (cf. Unger, 1975, pp. 192–93, who states that even this construction has a logical explanation and is quite plausible). If nothing else, these examples serve to highlight the difficulties involved in category A.9 due to the subjective nature of the feature in question.

missing in the Chronicler. On the other hand, both Ezra and Nehemiah exhibit extensive utilization of this imperfect lengthened form (more than fifty times in the two books).[13]

The cohortative occurs only three times in the post-Exilic prophets. The form occurs twice in Zech 10–14 (*'ešrəqāh* in 10:8 and *wā'aqhāh* in 11:13). In comparison with Chronicles (based on Polzin's figures), these data yield the following ratios:

Chr—1 in 1026 vss or .974 per 1000 vss
Hag—0 in 38 vss
Zech 1–8—0 in 121 vss
Zech 10–14—2 in 90 vss or 22.2 per 1000 vss or .503 per 1000 words
Mal—1 in 55 vss or 18.1 per 1000 vss or .796 per 1000 words

A.11 *wayhî* greatly recedes in Chronicles and in the younger language.

Acknowledging Driver (1922, p. 538) and Kropat (1909, pp. 23, 74), Polzin (p. 56) cites this feature as one of the more important aspects of LBH. Polzin (pp. 56–58) produces this evidence:

wayhî—125 in Kgs
wayhî—34 in Chr (the nonparallel passages)
wayhî—1 in Ezr
wayhî—14 in Neh

Polzin also cites the usage of *wəhāyāh* as an additional example of the distinction between early and late biblical Hebrew. One finds *wəhāyāh* thirteen times in Kings, but only twice in the Chronicler. The form occurs twice in Nehemiah and not at all in Ezra.[14]

13. Polzin (p. 55) maintains that Chronicles reflects the true situation in fifth century biblical Hebrew. Yet, he does not attribute the widespread usage of the feature in the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah to archaizing tendencies, but to "a plurality of scribal traditions being represented in the exemplars canonized in the MT."

As an aside, I would suggest that the geographical origin of the writings in question may also have a bearing on the differences in respect to utilization of the cohortative. Given the linguistic evidence, it seems quite apparent that the Jewish community remaining in Exile preserved classical Hebrew forms longer than the restoration community of Jerusalem. If the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah were penned in the Exilic community (a likely possibility), this would account for the widespread use of the cohortative in contrast to the Chronicler.

14. Polzin (p. 57) summarizes, "Ezra . . . agrees with the late usage of Chronicles whereas Nehemiah clearly attempts to represent the older language by its archaistic usages, thereby hiding the actual linguistic situation." Again, I would add that the differences between the memoirs of Nehemiah and Chronicles/Ezra may not be a chronological one, but one of geography, due to the nature of the development of late biblical Hebrew in the Exilic community in contrast to the restoration community of Palestine.

Polzin's rather disjointed figures yield these statistics when structured and projected systematically for the use of *wayhî*:

JE—21 in 216 vss or 97.03 per 1000 vss
CH—19 in 308 vss or 60.99 per 1000 vss
Kgs—125 in 1504 vss or 78.00 per 1000 vss
Dtr—20 in 269 vss or 74.21 per 1000 vss
P^g—36 in 678 vss or 52.92 per 1000 vss
P^s—7 in 578 vss or 12.11 per 1000 vss
Chr—34 in 1026 vss or 33.10 per 1000 vss
Ezr—1 in 210 vss or 4.76 per 1000 vss
N^1—14 in 177 vss or 78.96 per 1000 vss

The use of *wəhāyāh* in the same corpora is as follows:

Kgs—13 in 1504 vss or 8.53 per 1000 vss
Dtr—1 in 269 vss or 7.42 per 1000 vss
P^g—16 in 678 vss or 23.52 per 1000 vss
P^s—5 in 578 vss or 8.65 per 1000 vss
Chr—2 in 1026 vss or 1.95 per 1000 vss
Ezr—0 in 210 vss
N^1—2 in 177 vss or 11.33 per 1000 vss

wayhî occurs in the post-Exilic prophets in Hag 1:3, 2:20, Zech 4:8, 6:9, 7:1,4,8,12,13, 8:1 and the corresponding ratios are:

Hag—2 in 38 vss or 52.60 per 1000 vss or 2.42 per 1000 words
Zech 1–8—8 in 121 vss or 66.11 per 1000 vss or 3.24 per 1000 words
Zech 10–14—0 in 90 vss
Mal—0 in 55 vss

wəhāyāh occurs in the post-Exilic prophets in Zech 6:13,15, 8:13, 9:7, 12:3,8,9, 13:2,3,4,8, 14:6(2),7,8,9,13,16,17,20,21 and the corresponding ratios are:

Hag—0 in 38 vss
Zech 1–8—3 in 121 vss or 24.78 per 1000 vss or 1.21 per 1000 words
Zech 10–14—17 in 73 vss or 232.89 per 1000 vss or 10.51 per 1000 words
Mal—0 in 55 vss

A.12 In appositional relationship, the Chronicler prefers to place the substantive before the numeral and almost always puts it in the plural; this is contrary to the older practice of putting the number first.

According to Polzin's research on numerals (pp. 58–60), the Chronicler places the substantive first in seventy-six of the one hundred and twenty cases where the construction occurs. In Ezra, the substantive precedes the numeral in twenty-one of the twenty-two relevant examples.

The post-Exilic prophets use cardinal numerals a total of sixty-four times. In every instance the post-Exilic prophets follow the normal or older word order for cardinal numerals in apposition.

A.13 The Chronicler shows an increased use of the infinitive construct with *lə*.

Polzin follows Kropat (1909, p. 72) here, despite the fact that he offers "no specific data to substantiate the statement" (Polzin, p. 60). The glaring deficiency of Polzin's statistical methodology is most apparent in his discussion of the infinitive construct with *lə*. He offers as evidence:

2 Chr—1 inf const/*lə* every 2.6 vss
CH—1 inf const/*lə* every 2.9 vss
Dtr—1 inf const/*lə* every 2.6 vss

These data yield no clear distinction between early and late biblical Hebrew in regard to the use of the infinitive construct with *lə*. Polzin (p. 61) retreats by saying, "If the whole corpus of II Chr does not substantiate an increased usage of this feature, it is nevertheless true to say that large blocks of it do reveal such an increase." Polzin then focuses on the latter chapters of 2 Chronicles (29–36) in which he finds a density of one infinitive construct with *lə* every two verses. Thus, for Polzin (p. 61) at least "it would appear safe to say that this feature probably belongs to LBH."

A projection of Polzin's data on the infinitive construct with *lə* yields these figures:

Ch—108 in 308 vss or 344.68 per 1000 vss
Dtr—99 in 269 vss or 367.29 per 1000 vss
2 Chr—157 in 407 vss or 378.37 per 1000 vss

In the post-Exilic prophets, the infinitive construct with *lə* occurs seventy-seven times in the following ratios:

Hag—15 in 38 vss or 394.50 per 1000 vss or 18.50 per 1000 words
Zech 1–8—50 in 121 vss or 413.00 per 1000 vss or 20.25 per 1000 words
Zech 10–14—9 in 73 vss or 123.29 per 1000 vss or 5.50 per 1000 words
Mal—3 in 55 vss or 54.30 per 1000 vss or 2.39 per 1000 words

B.1 In citing material and its weight or measure, the Chronicler often has the order, material weighed or measured + its weight or measure (+ number).

According to Polzin (pp. 61–64), this contradicts the older practice of placing the number and the weight or measure before the material weighed

or measured (e.g. 2 Kgs 5:23, 7:1). The Chronicler follows the older order only in 2 Chr 27:5. Elsewhere (e.g. 1 Chr 22:14, 29:7, 2 Chr 2:9, 27:5), the Chronicler adopts this new order. This new order for material and its weight or measure also occurs in Ezr 2:69, 8:26; Neh 5:15, 7:69,70,71; and in biblical Aramaic in Ezr 7:22. Later mishnaic Hebrew reverses the trend and follows the older Hebrew idiom consistently. Kropat (1909, p. 47), Polzin (1976, p. 64), and others agree the feature can be attributed to Aramaic influence and practice.

Analysis of the post-Exilic prophets shows no examples of either construction. In Hag 2:16, references to measures occur, but neither fits the criteria outlined by Polzin. In Zech 5:2 and 11:12–13, other examples of this feature appear, again not exactly fitting Polzin's criteria, but in each case the order follows the older Hebrew idiom (i.e. number + measure).

B.2 *lə* is used often as a mark of the accusative.

Polzin (pp. 64–66), following Kropat (1909, p. 35) and Brockelmann (1913, II, pp. 315–19), notes the increased frequency of this feature in LBH, particularly in 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Daniel. According to Polzin (p. 65), "There can be little doubt that the *frequency* of this idiom in Chronicles/Ezra is the result of Aramaic influence."

An examination of the post-Exilic prophets reveals that *lə* as the accusative marker occurs only in Zechariah (1:15 and 8:14) and in Malachi (3:4,5). Given the limited distribution of this feature in the post-Exilic prophets, the size of the select corpora, as well as the incompleteness of the comparative data, no specific chronological determinations can be made based upon the use or nonuse of *lə* as the mark of the accusative.

B.3 In *min* 'from', the *nun* is often not assimilated before a noun without an article.

Although there are forty-four occurrences of *min* in construct with an anarthrous noun in the post-Exilic prophets, none reflects this tendency of the later language in dispensing with the assimilation of the *nun*.

B.4 The Chronicler uses the emphatic *lə* before the last element of a list.

This LBH feature, one of extremely limited distribution, occurs in biblical Hebrew and Aramaic. Polzin cites examples in 1 Chr 28:1, 29:6; 2 Chr 24:12, 26:14; Ezr 6:7; and Dan 4:33.

There are no examples of this feature in the language of the post-Exilic prophets, although each of the corpora contains lists serving as potential

candidates for such an expression (Hag 1:11, 2:6–7,12,19; Zech 1:8, 7:10, 14:15; Mal 1:13, 3:5).

B.5 In an attributive usage, *rabbîm* is twice placed before the substantive.

This feature of LBH (probably the weakest of all Polzin's diagnostic categories) is based on but three occurrences of *rabbîm* positioned before the substantive (1 Chr 28:5; Neh 9:28; and Prov 19:21). Although the lexical item *rabbîm* (or *rabbôt*) appears in the post-Exilic prophets (Zech 2:15, 8:20, 22; Mal 2:6, 8), the word occurs in the normal Hebrew word order.

B.6 The use of *'ad lə*, (for 'up to', 'until')

According to Polzin (p. 69), "Chronicles in general illustrates the late practice of multiplying the usage of *lə* wherever possible." The formation *'ad lə* occurs sixteen times in Chronicles and Ezra, but it does not occur in the post-Exilic prophets.

Before I set forth the conclusions prompted by the systematic and detailed linguistic analysis of the post-Exilic prophets, I want to put the research into perspective by providing an overview of the categorical relationships of the post-Exilic prophets to each other and to the various control corpora of Polzin. The additional prophetic books of Joel and Jonah were also linguistically analyzed and are included here solely for comparative purposes.

Observations and tentative conclusions based on the linguistic analysis of the post-Exilic prophets fall into two categories: (1) those involving the relationship of the post-Exilic prophets to the several established corpora of Polzin; and (2) those involving the relationship of the post-Exilic prophets to each other, especially the position of Zechariah 9–14 in the chronology of post-Exilic literature.

Firstly, even cursory observation reveals that the post-Exilic prophets are similar to the material in the sector labeled LBH in Figure 1. It is also clear, in terms of the total number of LBH features exhibited, that the post-Exilic prophets align themselves closely with Polzin's P^g corpus. This corpus contains four LBH features and seven classical BH features, while the post-Exilic prophets contain anywhere from two to four LBH features and eight to eleven classical BH features. Categorically, this places the post-Exilic prophets more or less as contemporary with P^g and prior to P^s (which contains eight features of LBH and retains but two classical BH features).

Polzin offers no attempt to correlate the linguistically-defined corpora

FIGURE 1

	A 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	B 1 2 3 4 5 6	
JE	p p p p p p p p p	p p p	Polzin's classical BH
CH	p p p p p p p p p	p p p	
Dtr	p p p p p p p p	p p p p	
P^g	o p x x p x p p x	p p o p	Polzin's LBH
P^s	o x x x p o x p x	x x o x	
Chr	x x x x x x x x x	x x x x	
Ezr	x x x x x x x	x x x	
N^2	x x x x x x	x x x	
N^1	x x x x x x x x x	x x x x	Polzin's "archaizing" LBH
Est	x x x x x x x	x x x x x	
Hag	p p p x p x x p p *x*	p p x p *p p*	Post-Exilic Prophets
Zech 1–8	p p p p p p x p p *x*	p p x p *p p*	
Zech 10–14	x p p p p p x x p *p*	x p o p *p p*	
Mal	p p p p p x x p p *p*	x p o p *p p*	
Joel	x p p p p x x p p	x p *p p*	Additional Prophets
Jonah	x p x p x x p p	p x *p*	

p = feature of classical BH
p = feature of classical BH in prophets, included for comparative purposes, not a part of Polzin's research or final typological tabulations
x = feature of LBH
x = feature of LBH in prophets, included for comparative purposes, not a part of Polzin's research or final typological tabulations
x̲ = Polzin's LBH "archaizing" feature
o = unique feature

with concrete historical time periods. The tentative suggestions made here are intended solely to furnish some kind of provisional chronological framework for the understanding of the relative associations established by the diagnostic linguistic analysis.

Although the official demise of the period of classical BH no doubt came with the fall of the Judean monarchy in 587 b.c., the roots of LBH can probably be traced to times before the destruction of Jerusalem. A round figure for the beginnings of the LBH period would be ca. 600 b.c. It is likely that the P^g corpus, to which the post-Exilic prophets are linguistically similar, dates to the time of the Exile. If this is the case, the post-Exilic prophets demonstrate considerable continuity with Exilic LBH, a conclusion not totally unexpected. P^s, the late chronological boundary

of the post-Exilic prophetic writings, proves more difficult to date. I prefer to date P^s to the period of Ezra's and Nehemiah's influence on the restoration community, sometime ca. 460–430 b.c. (cf. Driver, 1922, pp. 135–59). However, a date for P^s of 400–350 b.c., supported by many biblical scholars, is also plausible. Thus, the post-Exilic prophets can be placed within the general boundaries of a period extending from ca. 600 to 400–350 b.c. Even from this sweeping and somewhat detached chronological perspective, it is already possible to eliminate suggestions to date Zechariah 10–14 to the later Greek period or to the Maccabean period.

Secondly, Figure 1 illustrates the basic homogeneity of the post-Exilic prophets. All four corpora exhibit a low density of LBH features (from 2 to 4) and a relatively high density of classical BH features (from 8 to 11). A more careful examination of the linguistic data from the analysis of the post-Exilic prophets reveals that Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, and Malachi exhibit like ratios in four features (A.1, A.8, A.11, and A.13), while Zechariah 10–14 and Malachi also yield similar results in four categories (A.7, A.10, A.11, and A.13). Zechariah 1–8 and 10–14 are similar in three categories (A.6, A.9, and A.11); Haggai and Malachi are similar in two features (A.6 and A.11); and Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 exhibit similar ratios only in one feature (A.7). This last fact offers a useful caution regarding the diagnostic linguistic methodology, given that one would expect the greatest correlation between the two corpora dated to exactly the same year. No doubt the dissimilarities here are largely the product of the characteristics and peculiarities of individual style. This serves to underscore further the need for reserve in attempting to draw conclusions from statistical linguistic data.

In respect to actual dating, the linguistic method permits only approximations. Haggai and Zechariah 1–8 can be dated assuredly to 520 b.c. Given the diagnostic grammatical and syntactic similarities, nothing precludes one from dating Zechariah 10–14 (and Malachi) to the same general time frame. Clearly, Zechariah 10–14 (and Malachi) must be dated between 520 b.c. and the date of the P^s corpus of Polzin, since, linguistically, Zechariah 10–14 (and Malachi) lie between Haggai/Zechariah 1–8 and P^s on the biblical Hebrew continuum (below). Dating P^s, as stated earlier, is problematic given the limited nature of the linguistic evidence and the obscurity of the historical record. If P^s does indeed date to the time of Ezra's activity in post-Exilic Jerusalem, as suggested previously, then P^s can be dated sometime shortly after 458 b.c., perhaps as late as Nehemiah's first visit to Jerusalem in 445 b.c. (This last date is the subject of much dispute since there is no consensus on the date of Ezra's arrival in Jerusalem. I follow Cross (1975), who defends the traditional view that Ezra preceded Nehemiah, and that Ezra's arrival should therefore be dated

to the reign of Artaxerxes I and not to the reign of Artaxerxes II Memnon.)

Hence, given the linguistic similarities of Zechariah 10–14 to the other post-Exilic prophetic oracles, I date the work to the period of time between the writings of Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, 520 b.c., and the activity of Ezra, 458 b.c. I am well aware that this view contradicts the majority opinion of scholars on the date of Zechariah 10–14. However, in view of the diagnostic grammatical and syntactic homogeneity of the post-Exilic prophets, there seems to be little room for recourse to other alternatives. It is worth noting here that the conclusions of Kirkpatrick (1915, pp. 442–56), who dates Zechariah 9–14 to ca. 480–465 b.c., Freedman (1962 and 1976), who places the composition of the post-Exilic prophets and their incorporation into the canon at ca. 500 b.c., and Hanson (1975, pp. 280–401), who dates parts of Zechariah 9–14 to this same time frame, ca. 520–475 b.c., prove to be consonant with my analysis.

The expanded continuum of biblical Hebrew prose is included below. I have altered Polzin's continuum slightly, as I disagree with him on the placement of Ezr/N^2 and Est/N^1. I prefer to place Ezr/N^2 before Chr since it yields fewer LBH features than does the Chronicler. I place Est/N^1 (tentatively) before Ezr/N^2 and Chr, based on the hypothesis of alternative language development in the Jewish community which remained in Babylon after the establishment of the restoration community in Palestine. In opposition to Polzin, I view Esther and the memoirs of Nehemiah not as late "archaizing" works, but as works of Babylonian origin or background. The classical biblical Hebrew features contained in these works may not be deliberate archaizing tendencies of a later period, but features characteristic of the written language of the Jewish community remaining in Exile. I would say the classical biblical Hebrew features *remain* in Est and N^1, whereas Polzin would say they *reappear.* I have qualified the position of Est and N^1 on the continuum with a question mark because it is impossible to be sure that the written language of the Jewish Babylonian community underwent a development parallel to and distinct from that of the written language of the restoration community in Palestine (see further Hill, 1981, pp. 136–37).

IV

Based upon evidence from a typological analysis of the post-Exilic prophets, Zechariah 9–14 (and Malachi) most likely date to the period of

FIGURE 2

TYPOLOGICAL CONTINUUM OF BIBLICAL HEBREW

JE/CH/Dtr P^{g} Hag/Zech 1–8 Mal/Zech 10–14 P^{s} Est/N^{1} Ezr/N^{2} Chr

[?]

JE—12 stable classical BH features (*contra* A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5, A.6, A.7, A.8, A.9, A.11, A.12, A.13).

CH—12 stable classical BH features (*contra* A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5, A.6, A.7, A.8, A.9, A.11, A.12, A.13).

Dtr—12 stable classical BH features (*contra* A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5, A.6, A.7, A.8, A.11, A.12, A.13, B.1).

P^{g}—4 features of LBH are present (A.3, A.4, A.6, A.9); 7 features of classical BH remain (*contra* A.2, A.5, A.7, A.8, A.11, A.12, B.1); 2 unique features appear (A.1, A.13).

Hag—4 features of LBH are present (A.4, A.6, A.7, A.13); 9 features of classical BH remain (*contra* A.1, A.2, A.3, A.5, A.8, A.9, A.11, A.12, B.1).

Zech 1–8—2 features of LBH are present (A.7, A.13); 11 features of classical BH remain (*contra* A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5, A.6, A.8, A.9, A.11, A.12, B.1).

Mal—3 features of LBH are present (A.6, A.7, A.11); 9 features of classical BH remain (*contra* A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5, A.8, A.9, A.12, B.1); 1 unique feature appears (A.13).

Zech 10–14—4 features of LBH are present (A.1, A.7, A.8, A.11); 8 features of classical BH remain (*contra* A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5, A.6, A.9, A.12, B.1); 1 unique feature appears (A.13).

P^{s}—8 features of LBH are present (A.2, A.3, A.4, A.7, A.9, A.11, A.12, B.1); 2 features of classical BH remain (*contra* A.5, A.8); 3 unique features appear (A.1, A.6, A.13).

Est—6 features of LBH are present (A.1, A.5, A.7, A.8, A.13, B.2); 6 features of classical BH remain (*contra* A.4, A.6, A.9, A.11, A.12, B.1).

N^{1}—8 features of LBH are present (A.3, A.5, A.6, A.8, A.9, A.12, A.13, B.1); 5 features of classical BH remain (*contra* A.1, A.2, A.4, A.7, A.11).

Ezr—10 features of LBH are present (A.3, A.4, A.5, A.6, A.7, A.8, A.9, A.11, A.12, B.1); no features of classical BH remain.

N^{2}—10 features of LBH are present (A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5, A.6, A.7, A.11, A.12, B.1); no features of classical BH remain.

Chr—13 features of LBH are present (A.1, A.2, A.3, A.4, A.5, A.6, A.7, A.8, A.9, A.11, A.12, A.13, B.1); no features of classical BH remain.

"pre-Ezra decline" (ca. 520–450 or better 515–458 b.c.). Even though the Temple had been rebuilt and the sacrificial system restored, the vision of Ezekiel's Temple-state quickly faded amidst the stark reality of Persian domination and the problems of mere survival in a city surrounded by foreigners (cf. Hanson, 1975, pp. 280–86). Zechariah 10–14 (and Malachi) exhibit considerable linguistic continuity with Haggai and Zechariah 1–8, and both were probably composed during the early years of the period of "pre-Ezra decline."

It is likely that Exilic Hebrew was largely maintained (at least as the written language) in the official and religious circles of the restoration community by the first generation returnees from Babylon. This would account for the striking linguistic similarities of the post-Exilic prophets to each other and to the P^g corpus examined by Polzin. Those original returnees probably influenced the restoration community for a maximum of fifty or sixty years; a *terminus ad quem* of ca. 475 b.c. for Zechariah 10–14 (and Malachi) may be suggested. After ca. 475 b.c., written works would and do reflect the language changes absorbed by the second generation writers of the post-Exilic community (e.g. P^s).

The multiple problems of unraveling complex language changes in the post-Exilic period notwithstanding, continued refinement of Polzin's diagnostic method and further linguistic analysis of the Old Testament may well confirm these exploratory studies, and at the same time generate new evidence that will address the questions arising from this investigation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andersen, F. I. and D. N. Freedman. 1980. *Hosea.* (The Anchor Bible 24.) New York.

Bertholdt, L. 1814. *Historischkritische Einleitung in sämmtliche kanonische und apokryphische Schriften des Alte und Neue Testament.*

Brockelmann, C. 1913. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen.* Berlin.

Childs, B. S. 1979. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture.* Philadelphia.

Cross, F. M. 1975. "A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94:4–18.

Driver, S. R. 1922. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.* Rev. ed. New York.

Flügge, B. G. 1784. *Weissagungen welche bey den Schriften des Propheten Zacharias beygebogen sind.*

Freedman, D. N. 1962. "The Law and the Prophets." *Vetus Testamentum* Supplement 9:250–65.

_____. 1976. "Canon of the Old Testament." In K. Crim (ed.), *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Supplemental Volume, pp. 130–36. Nashville.

Hanson, P. D. 1971. "Jewish Apocalyptic Against its Near Eastern Environment." *Revue Biblique* 78:31–58.

_____. 1975. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic.* Philadelphia.

Hill, A. E. 1981. *The Book of Malachi: Its Place in Post-Exilic Chronology Linguistically Reconsidered.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Hoftijzer, J. 1965. "Remarks Concerning the Use of the Particle *'t* in Classical Hebrew." *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 14:1–99.

Hurvitz, A. 1968. "The Chronological Significance of Aramaisms in Biblical Hebrew." *Israel Exploration Journal* 18:234–40.

_____. 1974a. "The Date of the Prose-Tale of Job Linguistically Reconsidered." *Harvard Theological Review* 67:17–34.

_____. 1974b. "The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code: A Linguistic Study in Technical Idioms and Terminology." *Revue Biblique* 81:24–56.

Gesenius F. H. W. 1976. *Hebrew Grammar.* Ed. E. Kautzsch, 2nd ed., translated by A. E. Cowley. Oxford.

Keil, C. F. 1975. *Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets.* First published 1873, translated by J. Martin. Grand Rapids.

Kirkpatrick, A. F. 1915. *The Doctrine of the Prophets.* London.

Kropat, A. 1909. "Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik." *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 16:1–94.

Mendenhall, G. E. 1961. "Biblical History in Transition." In G. E. Wright (ed.) *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*, pp. 32–53. New York.

Newcome, W. 1809. *The Twelve Minor Prophets.* 2nd Ed. New York.

Parunak, H. V. D. 1979. *Linguistic Density Plots in Zechariah.* (The Computer Bible XX) n.p.

Polzin, R. 1976. *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose.* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 12) Missoula.

Radday, Y. T. 1973. *Analytical Linguistic Key-Word-In-Context Concordance to the Books of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi.* (The Computer Bible IV) n.p.

Radday, Y. T. and D. Wickman. 1975. "Unity of Zechariah Examined in the Light of Statistical Linguistics." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 87:30–55.

Segal, M. H. 1927. *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew.* Oxford.

Sellin, E. 1930. *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch.* (Kommentar zum Alten Testament XII) Leipzig.

Unger, M. G. 1975. *Zechariah: Prophet of Messiah's Glory.* Grand Rapids.